

**ENTERED**

March 15, 2023

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

ADAM CONTRERAS,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL CASE NO. H-22-4028
	§	
DAVID WILSON <i>et al.</i>	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER**

Adam Contreras, representing himself, filed a complaint containing no discernable claims. (*See generally* Docket Entry No. 1). The complaint was filed using the district court's form for filing a complaint for interpleader and declaratory relief. (*Id.*). Where the form asks the plaintiff to identify the basis of the court's jurisdiction him, Contreras checked boxes indicating that his claim arises under a federal statute and that it meets the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (*Id.* at 3). He identifies the federal statute as "Article VII USC, Lord, God, DOI, Bear Owner BOR James Madison." (*Id.* (capitalization modified for readability)). For the jurisdictional requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1332, Contreras writes that the plaintiff is "God, DOI, Lord USC, BOR/Adam Contreras"; the defendants are "James Madison" and "Joe Biden"; and that the amount in controversy is "\$999 Godzillion." (*Id.* at 3–4). Contreras writes similar text throughout the form. Contreras filed several other documents, each containing only page upon page of incomprehensible handwritten text. (*See* Docket Entry Nos. 5–12).

Contreras's complaint was filed in forma pauperis. The statute governing such cases states that the court "shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action or appeal . . . is frivolous . . . [or] fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(i)–(ii). A claim is frivolous if it lacks any arguable basis in law or fact. *Samford v.*

*Dretke*, 562 F.3d 674, 678 (5th Cir. 2009). A complaint lacks an arguable basis in fact when the plaintiff's allegations are so "fanciful," "fantastic," and "delusional" as to be "wholly incredible." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32–33 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 219, 325, 328 (1989)). Contreras's complaint is plainly fantastic, delusional, and lacking any basis in law or fact.

The court dismisses Contreras's complaint with prejudice because amendment would be futile. An order of dismissal will be separately entered.

SIGNED on March 15, 2023, at Houston, Texas.



---

Lee H. Rosenthal  
United States District Judge